

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY

To:

Axis Intellectual Capital Pte Ltd
21A Duxton Hill
Singapore 089487
SINGAPORE

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION

(PCT Rule 66)

Applicant's or agent's file reference WSY-P001WO		Date of mailing (day/month/year) 3 September 2004 (03.09.2004)
International application No. PCT/SG 2002/000145		REPLY DUE within 2 months/days from the above date of mailing
International filing date (day/month/year) 29 June 2002 (29.06.2002)	Priority date (day/month/year)	
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC IPC⁷: C02F 1/44		
Applicant WONG, SHIH, YI		

1. This written opinion is the **first** (first, etc.) drawn by this International Preliminary Examining Authority.
2. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:
 - I. ☒ Basis of the opinion
 - II. ☐ Priority
 - III. ☐ Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
 - IV. ☐ Lack of unity of invention
 - V. ☒ Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
 - VI. ☐ Certain documents cited
 - VII. ☐ Certain defects in the international application
 - VIII. ☐ Certain observations on the international application
3. The applicant is hereby invited to reply to this opinion.

When? See the time limit indicated above. The applicant may, before the expiration of that time limit, request this Authority to grant an extension, see Rule 66.2(d).

How? By submitting a written reply, accompanied, where appropriate, by amendments, according to Rule 66.3. For the form and the language of the amendments, see Rules 66.8 and 66.9.

Also For an additional opportunity to submit amendments, see Rule 66.4.
For the examiner's obligation to consider amendments and/or arguments, see Rule 66.4bis.
For an informal communication with the examiner, see Rule 66.6.

If no reply is filed, the international preliminary examination report will be established on the basis of this opinion.
4. The final date by which the international preliminary examination report must be established according to Rule 69.2 is: **29.10.2004.**

Name and mailing address of the IPEA/AT Austrian Patent Office Dresdner Straße 87, A-1200 Vienna	Authorized officer KOLLER G.
Facsimile No. 1/53424/200	Telephone No. 1/53424/458

Form PCT/IPEA/408 (cover sheet) (July 1998)

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.
PCT/SG 2002/000145

V. Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement			
1. Statement Novelty (N)	Claims	10-12, 22-24	YES
	Claims	1-9, 13-21, 25	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims	10-12, 22-24	YES
	Claims	1-9, 13-21, 25	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-25	YES
	Claims	----	NO

Citations and explanations

The following documents cited in the search report are considered for the purpose of this opinion:

D1 WO 96/34678
D2 US 4367140
D3 DE 3831965

Document D1 shows a device for the desalination of water comprising a chamber and a plunger movably arranged in it for the pressurization of water contained in said chamber. The plunger is moved along the axis of the chamber which is in gravitational direction. The chamber has means for charging and discharging fluid, an outlet to a desalination system and valves controlling the operation.

Consequently, it is considered that claims 1-9, 13-21 and 25 of the present application fail to meet the criteria of Article 33(2) (novelty) and Article 33(3) (inventiveness).

Concerning the embodiments of claims 10-12 and 22-24 nothing of particular relevance is retrieved.

Documents D2 and D3 do not show the overall features of the present application and are not considered to be of particular relevance concerning the subject-matter of the present application.

The industrial applicability is acknowledged.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

WRITTEN OPINION

International application No.

PCT/SG 2002/000145

I. Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the elements of the international application:*

☒ the international application as originally filed

☐ the description:

pages , as originally filed

pages , filed with the demand

pages , filed with the letter of

☐ the claims:

pages , as originally filed

pages , as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19

pages , filed with the demand

pages , filed with the letter of

☐ the drawings:

pages , as originally filed

pages , filed with the demand

pages , filed with the letter of

☐ the sequence listing part of the description:

pages , as originally filed

pages , filed with the demand

pages , filed with the letter of

2. With regard to the language, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the language in which the international application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

These elements were available or furnished to this Authority in the following language _____ which is:

☐ the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).

☐ the language of publication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).

☐ the language of the translation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under Rule 55.2 and/or 55.3).

3. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, the written opinion was drawn on the basis of the sequence listing:

☐ contained in the international application in printed form.

☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.

☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in written form.

☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority in computer readable form.

☐ The statement that the subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed has been furnished.

☐ The statement that the information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence listing has been furnished.

4. ☐ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

☐ the description, pages

☐ the claims, Nos.

☐ the drawings, sheets/fig

5. ☐ This opinion has been drawn as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).

* Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this opinion as „originally filed“.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY